II. Remarks

Reconsideration and re-examination of this application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is herein respectfully requested.

After entering this amendment, claims 1-20 remain pending with claims 1, 4-7, 9, and 11-20 currently under examination.

Further Claim Clarifications

Prior to discussing the references, it is believed that a brief discussion on the current form of the independent claims of this application is warranted.

The independent claims of this application recite that the first and second base layers have integrally formed first and second elements each *defined by a surface of rotation*. More particularly, claim 1 specifies a first and second surface of rotation respectively defining an enclosed first and second hollow interior. In addition, claim 13 specifies closed and dome-shaped first and second elements defined by a surface of rotation.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1, 4-7, 9 and 11-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,852,704, to Brockenborough et al. ("Brockenborough") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,604,735 to McCollough et al. ("McCollough"). Applicants respectfully traverses this rejection.

As noted by the examiner, Brockenbrough discloses an energy absorbtion and barrier device for automotive vehicles. More specifically, it discloses a stack of three sheet metal strips bent into a generally sinusoidal-shape and held

together by brackets 17. (*Brockenbrough*, col. 2, lines 65-68, col. 3, line 1, Fig. 1.) The sinusoidal shape runs in the direction of elongation (*id* at Fig. 1) and subsequent strips have nodes of increasing depth (*id.* at col. 3, lines 28-35). This results in open arch-shaped gaps running transverse to the length of the barrier device. *Id.* at Fig. 2.

Referring now to claim 1, it is submitted that Brockenbrough fails to disclose first and second elements each having *a surface of rotation defining an enclosed hollow interior.* Since the gaps of Brockenbrough have an arch shape open at each end, the rejection based thereon should accordingly be withdrawn.

Referring now to claim 13, it is submitted that Brockenbrough fails to disclose a plurality of hollow, *closed and dome-shaped* first and second elements *defined by a surface of rotation.* Rather, the gaps of Brockenbrough have an arch shape open at each end. Since the gaps of Brockenbrough are neither dome shaped nor enclosed by a surface of rotation, the rejection based thereon should also be withdrawn. Such action is hereby requested.

In that McCollough fails to disclose or suggest a surface of rotation or elements having an enclosed, or closed, hollow interior, which was previously noted as being absent in Brockenbrough, it must be concluded that the combination of Brockenbrough in view of McCollough cannot render the claims of the present application as obvious. The rejection under § 103 is therefore improper and should be withdrawn.

Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the present form of the claims are patentably distinguishable over the art of record and that this application is now in condition for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

March 31, 2006
Date

Eric J. Sosenko, Esq. (Reg. No. 34,440)